

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,824	07/30/2003	Nareak Douk	P1354 US	7296	
28390	7590 11/02/2005		EXAMINER		
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC. IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT			AHMED, A	AAMER S	
3576 UNOCAL PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403			3763		

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A	A 1: 4/)			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/629,824	DOUK, NAREAK			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Aamer S. Ahmed	3763			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Ju</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> .	action is non-final. ice except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 10-14 is/are wit 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or example and the specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accession.	election requirement.	- - - - -			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the control of the con	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/25/05 03/03/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claim 1-9, drawn to an aspiration catheter, classified in class 604, subclass 40.

II. Claims 10-14, drawn to a method of aspirating a vessel, classified in class 604,

subclass 508.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions

are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another

materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice

another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as

claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus. The apparatus as claims

comprises proximal and distal tubes, the distal tube is unremovably disposed within the first

lumen; the process of aspirating a vessel as claimed may be accomplished with any telescopic

aspirating catheter.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination

purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of

the claimed invention:

Group A:

Figures 1-3

Group B:

Figure 4

Art Unit: 3763

Group C: Figure 6

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with James Crittendon on October 26th, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of an aspiration catheter, claims 1, 2 and 4-6. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying

Application/Control Number: 10/629,824 Page 4

Art Unit: 3763

to this Office action. Claims 3, and 10-14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berthiaume U.S. Patent Number 5,846,259. Berthiaume discloses an aspiration catheter (10) comprising an aspiration shaft (20); a proximal tube (70) having a first lumen extending therethrough, wherein the proximal tube (70) is slidably disposed over the aspiration shaft (20) and a distal tube (60) having a second lumen extending therethrough, wherein the distal tube (60) is slidably disposed over the aspiration shaft (20) distal to the proximal tube, the distal tube is slidably positionable within the first lumen, at least a proximal end of the distal tube is irremovably disposed within the first lumen, and the aspiration shaft is irremovable from the second lumen (col. 5 line 27); and further comprising a guidewire shaft (30) having a guidewire lumen (see figure 1) disposed adjacent to the aspiration shaft (20) (see figure 1); and disposed along a distal segment of the aspiration shaft (20) (see figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3763

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berthiaume in view of Bagosian et al U.S. Patent 6,152,909. Berthiaume discloses the device as described above in reference to claim 1, but fails to disclose that the catheter comprises a distal aspiration port disposed at a distal tip of the aspiration shaft set at an oblique angle. Bagosian describes a similar device with a distal aspiration port (44) disposed at a distal tip of the aspiration shaft is set at an oblique angle (Figure 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by the applicant to modify the device of Berthiaume by incorporating the oblique angle aspiration port as taught by Bagosian et al in order to maximize the area of aspiration (Bagosian col. 12 line 5).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berthiaume in view of Ellis et al U.S. Patent Number 5,514,093. Berthiaume discloses the catheter as described above in reference to claim 1 including stop members a first proximal stop fixedly attached to an

Art Unit: 3763

interior surface of the proximal tube on a proximal end thereof (54) and a second proximal stop fixedly attached to an exterior surface of the distal tube on a proximal end thereof (52), and a second distal stop (56) fixedly attached to an interior surface of the distal tube on a distal end, however Berthiaume fails to explicitly disclose that the catheter device further comprises; a third proximal stop fixedly attached to an interior surface of the distal tube on a proximal end thereof; and a fourth proximal stop fixedly attached to an exterior surface of the aspiration shaft in a distal region thereof. Ellis et al discloses a similar device with a first distal stop (20) fixedly attached to the interior surface of the proximal tube on a distal end, a third proximal stop fixedly attached to an interior surface of the distal tube on a proximal end thereof (90); and a fourth proximal stop (48) fixedly attached to an exterior surface of the aspiration shaft in a distal region thereof. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the catheter device of Berthiaume by incorporating more stops as taught by Ellis et al in order to limit movement of the telescopic tubes.

Page 6

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U	S 5047	045 A	Arney; Michelle M. et al.
U	S 5484	409 A	Atkinson; Robert et al.
U	S 5498	240 A	Bagaoisan; Celso S. J. et al.
U	S 5591	194 A	Berthiaume; William A.
U	S 5484	424 A	Cottenceau; Jean-Philippe et al.
U	S 6562	021 B1	Derbin; J. Todd et al.
U	S 5338	301 A	Diaz; Juan-Carlos
U	S 2004	024933	7 A1 DiFiore, Attilio
U	S 2005	000455	3 A1 Douk, Nar eak
U	S 2002	014336	0 A1 Douk, Nar eak et al.
U	S 6706	055 B2	Douk; Nareak et al.
U	S 6818	006 B2	Douk; Nareak et al.

Art Unit: 3763

US 20040193114 A1 Elbert, Linda D. et al.

US 4917103 A

Gambale; Richard A. et al.

US 5234429 A

Goldhaber; Neil G.

EP 935974 A1 ISMAEL, BERNARD

US 6406471 B1

Jang; Yue-Teh et al.

US 6059814 A

Ladd; William Gregory

US 6248092 B1

Miraki; Manouchehr et al.

US 20050107739 A1 Palma, Giorgio Di

US 6234995 B1

Peacock, III; James C.

US 5466222 A

Ressemann; Thomas V. et al.

WO 9401169 A1

TREMULIS, WILLIAM S

US 5769868 A

Yock; Paul G.

US 6380457 B1

Yurek; Matthew T. et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aamer S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-5965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. Ahmed

Same Sged &

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI SUPERMISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3720

Page 7